LSTA Advisory Committee
Meeting Agenda - Wednesday, April 2, 2014
Comfort Inn & Suites, DeForest
DRAFT – DRAFT - DRAFT

Wednesday, April 2, 2014: 9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Members Present
Mary Driscoll (Dane County Library Service), Alison Eckes (Pauline Haas Public Library), Jennifer Einwalter (Slinger Public Library), Gus Falkenberg (Indianhead Federated Library System), Stacy Fisher (Waunakee Community School District), Erin Foley (Rio Community Library), Nyama Marsh (Whitefish Bay Public Library), Gerri Moeller (Outagamie Waupaca Library System), Krista Ross (Southwestern Wisconsin Library System), Marla Sepnafski (Wisconsin Valley Library Service), Cherilyn Stewart (Manitowoc Public Library), Linda Stobbe (Northern Waters Library Service), and Kristin Stoeger (Farnsworth Public Library).

Members Excused
Kelly Hughbanks (Milwaukee Public Library) and Eric Norton (McMillan Public Library).

Division Staff
Nancy Anderson, Martha Berninger, Ryan Claringbole, John DeBacher, Terrie Howe, Kurt Kiefer, Jamie McCanless, Tessa Michaelson Schmidt, Lisa Wiechert, and Denise Anton Wright.

Call to Order and Introduction
Howe called the meeting to order at 9:09 a.m. Committee members and staff introduced themselves. Alison Eckes has accepted another position in the state of Washington, so will be resigning from the committee.

Public Hearing
Howe announced that because only written comments have been received, the Public Hearing originally scheduled for 10:00 a.m. will take place later in the day as those LSTA categories are discussed.

Review of the Agenda
Howe reviewed the agenda, including the process to be followed. The meeting consists of reviewing grant categories, staff recommendations, and a public hearing. Committee recommendations and preliminary 2015 grant categories will follow in the afternoon. There were no changes suggested for the agenda.

Minutes of November 6, 2013 meeting
Falkenberg motion / Eckes second. Approval of minutes without amendment. Motion carried.

DLT Administrator's Remarks
Kiefer welcomed the members of the committee and thanked them for making the time to travel and meet in person. The LSTA grants are to be taken very seriously; the available funds need to be focused around our LSTA Five-Year Plan for Wisconsin (2013 – 2017) and are intended as "seed" funding to help projects get started and grow. Kiefer asked the committee to not only consider the federal LSTA funds, but to also think about issues and elements that will support the strategic needs of the library community and could be included in our state biennial budget requests.

DeBacher mentioned the recent news that the United States House Budget Committee issued a response to the President's budget proposal that included a proposal from Chair Paul Ryan (of Wisconsin) to zero out the IMLS budget which would directly impact public libraries and specifically, LSTA funds. DeBacher encourages everyone to keep an eye on this; the Wisconsin Library Association (WLA) will also be monitoring this situation. He also reminded the committee members that the Division cannot indicate grant funding status to grant recipients until we have a formal announcement from the federal government.

LSTA Coordinator's Report
Howe reported that at any one time we are dealing with three different LSTA budgets: the previous year, the current year, and the year to come. The 2012 LSTA Annual Report has been submitted and accepted. She reported that Wisconsin did not meet the state's "maintenance of effort" because state funds were cut by 10% for public library systems in 2011. The Division has been gathering information to request a waiver from the IMLS and avoid a penalty. Howe thinks that we have a strong case because we were not the only state library agency singled out.

Procedures for Discussion of LSTA Grant Categories & Conflict of Interest Policy
DeBacher referred everyone to the document, *LSTA Information and Guidelines for Wisconsin* (http://pld.dpi.wi.gov/files/pld/pdf/guide14.pdf). Today's LSTA Advisory Committee is a state committee and must follow open meeting law and proper ethics behavior. This committee is not approving the final expenditures at this meeting; that will take place at the November meeting. This year there have been several grant suggestions that have come from committee members. System staff and individuals involved with the grant suggestions can join in the discussion at this meeting. During the fall meeting committee members must be neutral in answering direct questions and recuse themselves from the voting process if a grant benefits their system or institution.

DeBacher and Howe reviewed three bullet points contained in the *LSTA Information and Guidelines for Wisconsin* (Chapter 12 – "Policy on Conflict of Interest"). Falkenberg asked if system staff can make recommendations about system technology projects? DeBacher stated that it is fine to discuss but to be certain that committee members first represent all the library interests in Wisconsin before they consider budget concerns at their local level.

LSTA 2014 & PRELIMINARY 2015 BUDGET OVERVIEW
Howe explained that the displayed spreadsheet shows a comparison of 2014 and 2015 funds and discussed the various budget categories. Highlighted categories on the spreadsheet are where the approved categories will go. DeBacher went over the preliminary 2015 budget overview. Howe then explained the differences between competitive and non-competitive grants.

Discussion of Preliminary Grant Categories for 2015
Division staff will provide a short explanation for each – then take questions from the committee members. Howe reported that Wisconsin is one of the states that allows for competitive grants using LSTA funds.

TECHNOLOGY
- **Broadband** – DeBacher reported that Bob Bocher still works for the Division on a limited term basis and that we are very grateful to have his continued involvement. Bocher is helping the Division frame Wisconsin's response to the e-rate revisions being considered at a national level. Kiefer has developed a good working relationship with the Department of Administration (DOA) and that Wisconsin's state

Chief Information Officer (CIO) David Cagigal has been a tremendous help, bringing an open attitude and passion for helping get broadband access into Wisconsin K-12 schools and public libraries.

Kiefer mentioned the recent Rural Schools Task Force and how broadband accessibility is a topic that everyone is looking at nationwide. DeBacher added that the DOA suggested there may be unspent state Universal Service funds that might be available. BadgerNet is the main contract and subcontracts with the smaller telecommunication (telcos) companies. USAC received extra money and clearance from the DOA to increase broadband and add fiber to libraries. Getting fiber installed sets up the structure for libraries to be better prepared for the new contracts in 2016, and for the goal for Wisconsin to be a "1 GB State." It also provides the telcos in the communities to have a subsidy to delivery more broadband into the communities, providing more competition. Bocher sent word that the Phase 2 libraries will be included after completion of Phase 1. DeBacher stated that we would like to continue the projects through the year and into next year for Phase 2. He also informed the committee that he recently received official word from IMLS that LSTA funds can help offset costs in local libraries for internal wiring, as well as help to absorb some of the costs for BadgerNet contracts if more bandwidth is needed for the library systems or member libraries.

Kiefer added that we are continuing the goal of increasing broadband at more affordable prices, that we need to have something here to keep the projects moving forward, and that everything has been going well so far. He said that we will get a new contract, and that libraries will have the chance to provide feedback. DeBacher mentioned that the library system IT people have been a tremendous help, citing the recent example of DOA needing bandwidth numbers and several people offering assistance.

- **Delivery Service** - Berninger explained that even though electronic delivery of materials is increasing, there is still a high demand for the delivery of physical items. Funds from this grant category are distributed to both the South Central Library System (to cover costs relating to the "backbone" of the statewide delivery system) and the Northern Waters Library System (to cover costs relating to the northern hub for statewide delivery).

- **Digital Creation Technology** – Claringbole reported that 2015 is the third year that this grant category would be offered. Purpose of this grant category is to develop and improve a library's digital resources. It's a very versatile category and can include non-digital aspects in the grant project. Funding has been increased to help encourage libraries and library systems to create large, inclusive /joint projects utilizing various kinds of collaboration. Schmidt stated that the funding has also been split into two levels: one for larger libraries and one for smaller. This breakdown has been added to all five competitive grants. Kiefer stressed that this grant category strongly aligns with the LSTA strategic plan, and includes all generations and helps foster creativity. DeBacher mentioned that next year's plans include creating a space for showcasing / demonstrating grant projects.

- **Digitize Historical Library Material** – Howe reported that there have been many applicants for this category in 2014. Beginning in 2015 the UWDCC will no longer be doing the digitization for public library and public library system grants. The requirement will remain that materials be accessible to everyone, both within the state and beyond. After this year, this grant category's requirements will be evaluated.

- **Learning Express License -** Berninger discussed the differences between this grant category and the Learning Express Computer Module. Sepnafski asked why there is volatility in the amounts for this grant category from year to year. Berninger explained that the discrepancy is due to changes in the various budget cycles (state budget (July 1-June 30) vs. federal budget (October 1-September 30). LSTA funds are allocated and reported on a calendar year (January – December) Stewart shared a story from their library on the usefulness of the Learning Express license.

- **Learning Express Computer Module** – DeBacher explained why this is a separate grant category. This is a collection of computer training resources that have a broader array of options for library patrons than the main Learning Express Library database. We award this so it is purchased on behalf of the state and included in the BadgerLink electronic resources.

- **Library Technology Consultant** – DeBacher stated that this is the position formerly held by Bob Bocher and now filled by Ryan Claringbole. This category is allowed in the LSTA budget and must be listed as a separate category and a separate project.

- **Library System Technology Projects** – Claringbole went over the details of this non-competitive grant category that is available to all 17 regional public library systems. Systems have been utilizing these funds in several different ways: broadband implementation, TEACH, BadgerNet, trouble shooting, WAN / LAN upgrades, etc. The DPI is looking at potentially changing the formula to re-allocate funds to assist libraries located in rural areas. Falkenberg asked when the funding was last increased for this grant category. Howe replied that in 2008 the category totaled $400,000 due to IMLS' distribution of additional funds that it had received.

  Falkenberg stated that most people think technology is getting cheaper and acknowledged that this is somewhat true; however, libraries use the funding from this grant to improve existing technology or support new technology – both of which can be expensive. So it wouldn't be out of line for the committee to increase the funding for this category. Howe explained that while some funds for the grant go towards new technology, other systems are using it to supplement their budget and wondered what would happen if the grant disappeared. Kiefer mentioned the importance of using these funds for "emerging technology." Falkenberg said that these funds are used more for infrastructure rather than new gadgets. Kiefer asked Falkenberg for an example. Falkenberg mentioned mobile routers for off-site library programming and mobile kiosks for smaller communities. Moeller asked for some clarification with the change in formula. DeBacher states that we can go into more details about it later during the voting discussion. Moeller mentioned that at times the OWLS' grant went toward paying for the same thing to make workflow more efficient. DeBacher said that was understandable, and that many systems have done that. He stressed the role of federal funding into state support versus the duty of an individual library.

  Kiefer stressed the use of federal funds to help libraries try new things with the added goal of being replicated elsewhere and supported with local funds. DeBacher sees LSTA funds as "seed money". Moeller is interested in the idea of additional funding for rural areas. DeBacher mentioned that systems with a lot of square miles don't fare well with the current funding formula. Howe added that if the formula changes either way, there will be winners and losers. DeBacher said that we need to be able to justify our programs, so we're trying to think of how we can be less unfair. Moeller mentioned that OWLS was probably one of those systems who funded the same projects with system technology funds. DeBacher said that innovative categories are difficult to categorize.

- **RL&LL – Statewide Technology** – Berninger discussed this grant, stating that it is essential for funding staff and services necessary for people who live in the state. They include staff that run BadgerLink, ILL, the Wisconsin Digital Archive, create training materials, develop BadgerLearn, BadgerLearn Pro, etc. The funding amount was increased this year to match the increase in costs of the OCLC ILL contract, and funds have been added in the budget for conference activities due to demand. Other costs are salary increases mandated by the state. Kiefer asked whether Berninger could post the statistics on the Google folder for the committee. Berninger said the statistics are already on the BadgerLINK website.

- **RL&LL – WISCAT** - Berninger discussed this grant. WISCAT is the virtual catalog that is used by many libraries in the state. Individual libraries pay $200 a year for the ability to use the service. Use of LSTA funds helps to offset the costs of the WISCAT license.

SERVICES TO SPECIAL POPULATIONS
Schmidt said there is general confusion about what "serving special populations" means and wants to provide some definitions. Special populations can mean one thing in one community, something else in another community. Sometimes it covers outreach from the library or people with a unique set of circumstances. The term can be used very broadly. IMLS definitions for special populations include diverse geographic backgrounds, disabilities, homeless, incarcerated, etc. Other populations can be addressed outside of these definitions and there's an ongoing discussion among the library community about expanding what the term special populations mean.

- **Accessibility Projects** – Schmidt reported that this is a longstanding category. The word "accessibility" can have issues related to it. It's often a stand-in for "ADA" but can mean a lot more than just physical access. One example could just be awareness of library services. Howe announced that the intent is to offer planning grants on accessibility issues in the community. Eckes asked if an appropriate use of these funds would be addressing language barriers within an existing project – such as Growing Wisconsin Readers. Schmidt said yes, if the library is truly trying to overcome a barrier (signage, adjustment to services). Those would be access issues; there is definitely some overlap.

- **Literacy Projects** – Howe reported that the requested amount has been reduced in this category. DeBacher added that the amount was adjusted because a specific initiative (a subset of early literacy) was offered last year as a separate category. This category includes serving a special population either inside or outside of the library as well as literacy and learning skills.

- **Early Learning Initiative - Growing Wisconsin Readers** – Schmidt reported that 2015 will be the final year for this category / statewide initiative. This is a non-competitive grant.

- **Early Literacy Projects** – Schmidt reported that this competitive grant category is a subset of literacy projects (see above). This grant is tied to *Growing Wisconsin Readers* and will disappear when that project is finished. In 2014 the Division received the largest number of applications in this category – 14 last year. Of this total, nine were funded.

PUBLIC HEARING
At this point, because Kiefer needed to leave for another meeting, Howe asked that the agenda jump ahead to the written testimony submitted about categories: Merging Integrated Library Systems, Public Library System Technology, and Digitization categories.

- **Merging Integrated Library Systems (ILS)** – DeBacher reported that testimony was received regarding this category. He is ever optimistic about the state creating larger areas of service. System and Resource Library Administration of Wisconsin (SRLAAW) compiled and distributed their standards recommendations last year. This category is approximately eight years old; it was brought back specifically because several systems were interested in merging integrated library systems (ILS). No mergers or efforts to consolidate system ILS took place, so there is a carryover of $30,000 for 2015.

A letter was received from three systems (Indianhead Federated Library System, Northern Waters Library System, and Wisconsin Valley Library System- WVLS) regarding the merging of their ILS. Howe read the letter as testimony then asked for clarification of their intentions from the Director of Wisconsin Valley and Technology consultant. They were asked if the request was to study merging or to actually merge. Sepnafski reported that libraries will vote if they would like to be part of the project, so the money would be for the actual merger. Marsh asked what the benefits would be of merging ILS. Sepnafski replied that there would be cost savings by getting rid of redundancies. DeBacher explained that this request is for costs going forward.

Sepnafski said that the process has been very participatory, there are a total of 99 libraries involved. Listening sessions were offered last year and WiLS is helping with this project. There have been seven committees (comprised of staff from member libraries) created to explore various aspects of a merged ILS. Draft recommendation reports were recently submitted from each committee. Results of surveys will go back to committees for discussion and recommendations. Falkenberg reported that a site (librarieswin.org - Project WIN) has been created with details of the process, the governance report, etc. Howe asked whether the vendor has been part of this process and what kind of costs has the vendor discussed. Falkenberg replied that yes, the vendor has been involved and that savings will be seen in the hardware and networking platform as well as savings on the discovery platform. Sepnafski said that other Wisconsin systems are watching this process and have had questions. DeBacher reported that questions have also come in from Illinois regarding the process.

DeBacher asked whether the three systems would be open to further expansion of the shared ILS. Sepnafski said that from the perspective of WVLS, she has been keeping the idea of further integration in mind during the planning process. Kiefer clarified that this is done with the intention of other systems joining in. Falkenberg stated that going from 50 libraries to 99 libraries is difficult, but once you get past that hurdle the process is easier, leaving room for others to join. DeBacher cautioned that the systems can't push library boards to vote for this, they can only inform and let the member libraries decide. He also mentioned that with the upcoming Polaris /Innovative mergers many systems will potentially be under one vendor. Stewart stated the category has a lot of merit and incentivizes the project. Kiefer added that state support is perfectly suited for this type of topic. The three systems in this project would very much welcome state support.

Foley asked how many member libraries of these three systems are not members of the ILS. DeBacher said that statewide trends reflect that it's normally large libraries or very small libraries that are not members of the ILS. For the three systems involved there are a total of seven libraries that are not members of the system ILS. Foley mentioned that the high cost of her system's ILS is the major reason her library is not a member. Kiefer suggested that the cost of continuation might be something that could be built into sustainability. Falkenberg mentioned that among the three systems, an average of 2 to 3% of a library's budget pays for costs relating to ILS membership. Foley said that her system's average cost is much higher. Kiefer said that he applauds the effort and thought that has gone into this project.

Library System Technology – DeBacher stated that Paul Onufrak (not present) submitted a letter asking the LSTA Committee to continue to support the Library System Technology projects at or above the current level of funding.

Digitization – Howe shared a letter from staff at the Hedberg Public Library in Janesville regarding their support of the LSTA digitization grant category

END OF PUBLIC HEARING

LIBRARY IMPROVEMENT

- **Independent Author Recognition** – DeBacher discussed that the inspiration for this category came from the Wisconsin Public Library Consortium (WPLC) and the issues surrounding independent authors. It addresses the challenges public libraries face on how to identify independent publishers and authors as well as identifying works that are worthy of publishing. There are projects taking place in other states (such as *"Soon To Be Famous"* in Illinois) that center on local and independent author awards. DeBacher would like to see homegrown ways developed for libraries to promote books similar to the 1930's when major library reviewing resources such as *Booklist*, *Horn Book*, and the *Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books* were created by librarians.

The Committee adjourned for lunch at 12:02 p.m. Kiefer left the meeting.
Howe called the meeting back to order at 12:42 p.m.

LIBRARY IMPROVEMENT *(Discussion continued from before lunch)*

- **Merging Public Library Systems** - DeBacher would like to see this category continued in order to show the Division's support for this issue
- **School Library Project** – Nancy Anderson reported on plans for a Guided Inquiry Institute which would focus on the research approach to learning. This approach can be used in a cross-disciplinary process; would involve other teachers, administrators, and public library youth services staff. She said there may be WiseLearn funds that could match what goes into the portal for professional development.
- **Statewide Library Improvement** – DeBacher reported a drop in the total requested amount for this category. The LSTA amount apportioned for his salary has been reduced from 80% to 45% for 2015. The LSTA amount for Howe's salary will be 30%. And the LSTA amount for McCanless' salary will be 100%. Division staff duties match the approved details for this category.
- **Youth Services Development Institute** – Schmidt reported that this Institute takes place every two years in rotation with the Public Library Directors Boot Camp. Attendees are librarians working with children and teens and those who hope to. The Institute was first offered in 2013 as a three-and-a half day retreat with 25 participants from all over the state. An online community has stemmed from that

Institute. Sepnafski asked whether the alumni of the Institute will be involved with the subsequent ones. Schmidt replied that yes, this is very much the intent.

- **Youth & Special Services Consultant** – DeBacher reported that this category includes Schmidt's position as well as related travel, materials, and supplies.

LSTA ADMINISTRATION

- **LSTA Administration** – Howe reported that her position is partially paid from this category as is an office assistant. Only 4% of the federal award can be used toward administration.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON PRELIMINARY GRANT CATEGORIES AND BUDGET FOR 2015

- Sepnafski motion / Driscoll second. Approve the amounts recommended for the **Youth & Special Services Consultant** and **Youth Services Development Institute.** No discussion. Motion carried unanimously.
- Eckes motion / Ross second. Approve the amounts recommended for all **Services to Special Populations** categories. No discussion. Motion carried unanimously.
- Stewart motion / Moeller second. Approve the amounts recommended for the **Broadband** category. Falkenberg asked about the $100,000 carryover. DeBacher replied that the Division won't know more until the project is finished, and mentioned that AT&T has been kind enough to absorb the drilling cost since that is considered construction and not an allowable LSTA cost. Stewart asked if the funds in this grant will be available for the libraries. DeBacher replied that if the telco bills the library necessary costs, then this grant would help but it must come from the systems. He also stated that the grant can help offset additional bandwidth costs. Motion carried unanimously.
- Ross motion / Stoeger second. Approve the amounts recommended for **Delivery Service**. No discussion. Motion carried with one abstention from Stobbe.
- Moeller motion / Einwalter second. Approve the amounts recommended for **Digital Creation Technology.** No discussion. Motion carried unanimously.
- Marsh motion / Ross second. Approve the amounts recommended for **Merging Integrated Library Systems** with an additional $75,000 added. DeBacher said content will be shared and open to feedback for the fall meeting. This will also be a competitive category – he will communicate what the factors would be involved with the grant. Motion carried with three abstentions from Falkenberg, Stobbe, and Sepnafski.
- Moeller motion / Stobbe second. Approve the amounts recommended for **Digitization of Library Materials**. No Discussion. Motion carried unanimously.
- Ross motion / Sepnafski second. Approve the amounts recommended for the **Study of Public Library Systems / LEAN Study.** No Discussion. Motion carried unanimously.
- Stewart pointed out that there is no funding budgeted in 2015 for the **Digital Content Buying Pool**. This project received LSTA funding for three years (2012, 2013, and 2014) plus a preliminary fourth year took place in 2011. So the recommendation was not to use LSTA funds in 2015. Falkenberg said that Kiefer has asked for items to go into the state budget. If the digital buying pool were a line item, how would this impact the vendor selection? DeBacher said that there would be a bidding process for something like this. Einwalter asked for a clarification on the involvement of public libraries in a model like this. DeBacher said that he's hesitant to rely on LSTA funds for a digital buying pool and that Berninger has more expertise on the state procurement process. While Kiefer makes a valid point on the "ask," DeBacher said he realizes the political situation. Stewart questioned the timeframe for the implementation of a statewide digital program. She would hate to see the current situation

diminished. She also asked about the distinction between what is currently in BadgerLINK and what is in OverDrive. Einwalter said that no OverDrive-like statistics can be gathered in BadgerLINK.

Stewart motion / Einwalter second to use LSTA monies to fund the Digital Buying Pool at $50,000. Discussion took place. Einwalter said that libraries have been told that 2014 would be the final year for the LSTA support. Moeller said that she sees the importance of the Digital Buying Pool, but realizes libraries need to start shifting their collections budget to incorporate digital content. DeBacher mentioned that there are shifts in patterns of usage and acknowledged patrons' use of Netflix and other streaming media. Einwalter stated that there are mental hurdles for libraries regarding digital media costs and the current situation of digital media circulation not being included in calculations for county payments. Falkenberg reported that libraries in his system as a whole are seeing 10% of their circulation coming from digital materials; this is a huge spike. One example from his system is Freegal. Also, the cost per circulation of digital materials is much lower than for a physical item. At this point Howe proposed that the group take a short break then come back to this topic and vote.

Committee adjourned for a short break at approximately 1:33 p.m.
Howe called the meeting back to order at 1:48 p.m.

- **Digital Buying Pool –** Howe called for the vote. Yes – 1; Opposed – 12. Motion did not carry.
- Moeller motion / Falkenberg second. Approve the amounts recommended for the **Library Technology Consultant**. No discussion. Motion carried unanimously.
- Sepnafski motion / Marsh second. Approved the amounts recommended for **Statewide Library Improvement**. No discussion.   Motion carried unanimously.
- Fisher motion / Eckes second. Approved the amounts recommended for **School Library Project**. No discussion. Motion carried unanimously.
- Marsh motion / Stobbe second. Approved the amounts recommended for **Communication & Planning.** No discussion. Motion carried unanimously.
- Einwalter motion / Ross second. Approved the amounts recommended for **Learning Express & Computer Module**.   Stewart asked about Kiefer's suggestion of a statewide funding model. DeBacher talked about a possible timeline for a statewide funding model. Motion carried unanimously.
- Stobbe motion / Moeller second. Approved the amounts recommended for **RL & LL Statewide Technology.** No discussion. Motion carried unanimously.
- Driscoll motion / Eckes second. Approved the amounts recommended for **RL&LL - WISCAT**. No discussion. Motion carried unanimously. Berninger thanked everyone for their support.
- Marsh motion / Falkenberg second. To increase the amounts recommended for **Library System Technology Projects** from $350,000 to $360,000. No discussion. Motion carried with five abstentions (Sepnafski, Stobbe, Ross, Falkenberg, and Moeller).
- Stoeger motion / Moeller second. Approved the amounts recommended for the **Independent Author Recognition**. No discussion. Motion carried unanimously.
- Marsh motion / Stewart second. Approved the amounts recommended for **Merging Public Library Systems**. No discussion. Motion carried unanimously.
- Falkenberg motion / Driscoll second. Approved the amounts recommended for the **Administration for LSTA**. No discussion. Motion carried unanimously.

REVIEW OF LSTA PROCESS FOR 2015

Howe asked the committee to think of recommendations for state funding for the next biennial budget meeting. Kiefer has hinted at initiatives that may be appropriate for the statewide budget process. DeBacher will mention this topic on Friday for the LD & L meeting and it will also be brought up at the May SRLAAW meeting. DeBacher suggested thinking of a big budget "ask" that would include resources for all Wisconsin residents.

Howe stressed the importance of the LSTA Long Range Plan; the 2015 LSTA Information & Guidelines will be available online in May. Howe asked if the Guidelines are helpful to everyone and if applicants refer to them. Schmidt asked what format educational webinars on the LSTA application process might take. Moeller suggested that a webinar for first-timers would be great – idea seconded by Eckes. Stewart suggested including information on the difference between successful and not successful grants. Ross mentioned that possibly a refresher for all system people on what has changed. Moeller appreciates the fact that some categories are geared to libraries and some to systems. She also likes the fact that some grants can be cooperative among two or more systems. Falkenberg asked if it is difficult getting grant reviewers. Howe replied that yes, it is and she asks committee members for assistance getting reviewers. Falkenberg suggested adding a step for those that would like to have a peer reviewer look the application over informally before the grant is submitted. This could be very helpful for first time applicants. Stewart asked if the successful grants are available online. Howe replied that all abstracts are online; full applications are available upon request. Howe also reported that the IMLS is planning to have final evaluation reports available online in the future. Foley said that the Annual Report Worksheet was very helpful this year. Would there be something similar available for the LSTA grant? Howe said that information can be entered into the application form and saved currently for practice (like the Annual Report Worksheet), so this might need to be made clearer on the form. Schmidt summarized the suggestions: a big picture view of the application process, more tools available, systems refresher webinar, webinar for novices, and making peer reviews an option.

Schmidt reported that during June there will be webinars for different types of applicants; the applications should be ready in May and due in September. Reviewers will do their work in October with the results ready for the November 19th LSTA meeting. DeBacher reminded everyone that we will begin reviewing the current LSTA plan this fall. We will get the information to the committee in advance. Howe added that any major changes to the LSTA plan need to be submitted to the federal government in April.

Next meeting – November 19, 2014. Location will most likely be the same – Comfort Inn and Suites in DeForest.

Final Comments: There were none. Kiefer left the meeting at approx. 12:30 because he had another meeting to attend. DeBacher did not have any comments.

The meeting adjourned at 2:29 p.m.

Recorded by Denise Anton Wright with assistance from Ryan Claringbole